

**Council on Technology Services  
Privacy, Security & Access Work Group  
October 5, 1999**

**Present:** Cheryl Clark (DMV), Kevin Cadieux (DMV), David Bunn (DMV), Jim Adams (DIT), Andy Poarch (DIT), Ray Davis (DGIF), Mike O'Neil (DSS), Dan Galloway (SCC), Ed Morris (DOC), Bill Russell (Co. of Chesterfield), Captain Vass (VSP), Pat Jackson (VT), Peggy Maupin (DGS), Dan Ziomek (DTP), Virgil Kopf (DGIF), Brandon Weidner (Computer Associates), Gerry Anderson and Michael Snipes (both with Entrust) by telephone.

**Absent:** Dan Houlihan (VIPnet), John Palese (DSS), Teresa Thomas (APA), Timothy Sigmon (UVA), Darrell Gasaway (DJJ), Carrie Gillotte (GMU) and Gordon Jarratt (Co. of Fairfax).

The October 5, 1999 COT's Privacy, Security & Access (PSA) Work group meeting was held at the DMV Headquarters. Minutes from the meeting held 9/7/99 were reviewed and approved. Vivian will have minutes posted to the web site.

Cheryl Clark reviewed events since the September meeting.

- September 7 - Cheryl met with Secretary Upson reference the PSA/COTS report. He is receptive to any legislation the work group may recommend be introduced to the 2000 General Assembly..
- September 21 - Cheryl, Dan Ziomek and Andy attended the last meeting of JCOTS. Discussion at this meeting focused the UETA model legislation for electronic documents and signatures. (Many thanks to Fred Norman for apprising us of this event.)
- September 24 - Andy Poarch, Kevin Cadieux and Cheryl met with John Westrick, OAG, regarding legal issues and any potential statutory changes to distinguish electronic signatures from digital signatures. The current statute does not impede electronic signatures.

Cheryl stated three points of statute which are under consideration:

1. What are any perceived inadequacies with the current statute which would impede moving forward with digital signatures.
2. Perceived problem with the current term "electronic" being associated with the attributes of "digital". Define the definition.
3. Whether there is any conflict between the Secretary's duties regarding standards and policies and those

which the Electronic Signatures Act provides for agencies, institutions, etc.

## **PSA WORK GROUP EVENTS**

Cheryl Clark reviewed upcoming October events:

- October 8 - Video Tele Conference at the Department of Information Technology with the State of Washington to explore their pilot programs on PKI RFP process.

*Action: Solicitation of specific questions from work group by cob 10/7.*

- October 13 - Department of Game & Inland Fisheries will host a pilot work session on their internal applications on digital signatures.
- October 15 - Meeting at University of Virginia hosted by Chip German to which members are invited. Richard Guida, Chair, Federal PKI Steering Committee, who also spoke at the Work Group Breakout Session at COVITS, will be present to talk about the federal "bridge architecture". This meeting could be very informative about what architectural approach that the work group might recommend in the COTs report.
- October 18-22 post draft report contents to the COTS community. Friday, October 22 close contents for report and submit for printing.

Gerry Anderson stated that the document contents need to be completed when sent to the COTS community. This would give the COTS community a preview on what will be presented at the COTS meeting on October 27.

Mike O'Neil stated that the posting period needed to be shortened. Conduct the posting period, in final form, to the COTS community starting on October 22-26.

Cheryl Clark stated that changes will be part of the record but not necessarily incorporated into the report.

The work group recommended that at the close of business of October 21, comments from the work group will be submitted to Kevin Cadieux.

Cheryl Clark stated that she will have some of the document contents posted in their entire framework on the Cold Fusion site on October 11, which can be viewed on October 12 for comments from work group members.

*Action: Cheryl will post document contents on the Cold Fusion site by 10/11 for work group members to review/comment on October 12.*

Cheryl Clark discussed the Seat Management's Final Report which was well received at the COVITS Conference. They incorporated the technical appendixes, minutes, associated documents using various software. Secretary Upson was very complimentary about this "packaging" of work group documents, so

this will be followed as a model for the psa report.

Arrangements have been made through DMV for the printing of the PSA Final Report and Addenda on October 25-26.

## **PSA/COTS REPORT**

Kevin Cadieux presented his draft report and discussed the contents of the report. Kevin stated that it was very important to educate readers on what is a digital signature and the difference between basic/limited electronic signatures versus digital signatures. Need a clear distinction of the two definitions. He outlined the different sections within the draft.

Michael Snipes stated that it was very important to define the difference between a digital signature and an electronic signature. He also stated that it was very important to have a trust within the community. The architecture within the infrastructure must be reliable and deliver a secure environment to the community.

Cheryl Clark requested that if any work group member had any formative documents that they would recommend citing in the report, to notify her of these by 10/22.

*Action: Work group members forward comments/recommendations to Kevin or Cheryl by cob 10/22.*

Ray Davis stated that the OAG's Office should review the draft report. The definition of digital signatures should be broad and not to narrow the definition or legal issues could arise.

Cheryl Clark stated that John Westrick, Assistant Attorney General, has agreed to assist with the legal issues relating to digital signatures. He has reviewed the report chapter on legal issues and comments for one of the work group's industry partners.

Cheryl asked Ray Davis if he would volunteer and assist in the language of E/Dsigns definitions and legal issues.

*Action: Ray Davis will work with the Cheryl and John Westrick on the legal issues and definitions.*

Dan Ziomek referenced some findings or verbiage that should be included in the final report.

*Action: Dan Ziomek will forward information to Kevin Cadieux for review.*

Cheryl Clark stated that other agencies are considering the use of pilots and demonstrations for digital signatures. DIT is considering an "agency to agency" demonstration and "agency to business" demonstration dealing with contracts. VDOT is considering an agency to business demo.

Dan Galloway stated that the SCC and Bill Russell, County of Chesterfield, are looking into an "agency to local government" demonstration.

*Action: Dan Galloway will report back to work group.*

Cheryl Clark asked if there were any recommendations or questions regarding the report.

Michael Snipes stated that under the "Digital Signature" section, need to elaborate/clarify what a digital signature means and the authentication process. What is the level of trust that parties can rely on? Network needs to be trusted.

Cheryl Clark stated that some states have a lengthy, prescriptive statutory framework in place for digital signatures. Virginia needs to determine the correct balance of legal framework without inhibiting the development of new authentication technologies. The prevailing philosophy in Virginia is toward "minimal" codification.

Ed Morris stated that the Code would have to specify PKI, if you were going to use digital signatures. The statute has to specify the use of digital signatures in relationship where there is not an area of trust established. Cheryl Clark stated that John Westrick indicated that the present statute is sufficient..

Michael Snipes stated that you should be able to establish an area of trust when using digital signatures. Authentication is critical to ensure the digital signature provides data trust. Need to define integrity and level of trust.

Kevin Cadieux asked Michael if they had any examples of Trust Models and Risk Models.

*Action: Gerry Anderson and Michael Snipes, Entrust, will send examples of models to Kevin Cadieux.*

Kevin Cadieux stated that Washington State used two forms of authentication "licensed vs. non-licensed". This increased the deployment of authentication to permit a valid registration process. Washington State did not have the capabilities for Government to Government transactions.

Captain Vass stated that we should be cautioned with developing too many constraints on the processes in conducting business with digital signatures. Agencies are currently using various forms of signatures in conducting business.

## **DIGITAL SIGNATURE INPUT**

Gerry Anderson, Entrust, gave a brief overview on topics that they recommend to be incorporated in the final report. He stated that

- o the Commonwealth needs to create a policy that is based on standards that allows for central administration, but can be managed and controlled locally by agencies, localities and other public entities.

- o Establish digital signature as an infrastructure so that agencies can trust

- o One infrastructure and a rapid deployment with high adoption.

Gerry stated that pilots on digital signatures needed to be into one project. Develop a PKI educational meeting and not to lower the standards in order to reduce the level of risk associated with e-government in the Commonwealth.

Andy Poarch stated that Dan Ziomek should review the enterprise architecture and see if he is comfortable before adding into report.

Gerry Anderson stated that Canada is ready to adopt PKI Infrastructure principles and guidelines and he will provide a copy for review and reference.

Dan Ziomek gave out two-web site addresses of possible interest to members. Both the Canadian Government site and the Federal (GITS) site provide good examples and general information on PKI policy issues:

[http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/pki/home\\_e.html](http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/pki/home_e.html)

<http://gits-sec.treas.gov/gits-sec-home.htm>.

Cheryl Clark stated that DIT has agreed to conduct a survey to agencies to assess needs for PKI/Digital services if the work group wants to recommend this. The survey could be completed by mid November.

Cheryl stated that Kevin will be providing the State of Washington with advance questions prior to the October 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. The meeting is a public meeting and industry individuals are invited.

*Action: Work group members send questions/comments to Kevin or Cheryl by cob 10/7.*

## **PSA WEB SITE**

Dan Galloway updated the work group on the PSA Web site. He indicated that the contents will remain the same. Mike O'Neil and Andy Poarch have reviewed and approved the site. Contents will remain with assigned members for updating even after it has gone out to the public community. It will be posted out on the COTS page as a link for public viewing on 10/5.

Andy Poarch stated that he would wait to post the web site until after the COTS meeting on 10/27. Have the

official opening at the COTS meeting.

Dan Galloway suggested letting the COTS group view before the meeting to solicit any comments they might have before opening to the public community.

It was agreed by the work group to hold the opening of the PSA Web site until the COTS 10/27 meeting in Virginia Beach.

## **GROUP DISCUSSION**

Ed Morris gave a "heads-up" on the State's RFP on the Commonwealth of Virginia's Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS). ICJIS Technical Committee with need assistance from agency policymakers, work groups to help in developing legislation in the privacy/security area. ICJIS would turn over their recommendations to the PSA Work group for their review/action. The PSA Work group would forward their recommendation/action to COTS prior to the 2001 Session of the General Assembly.

Cheryl Clark stated that ICJIS is just one example of the broader issues this work group was originally charged with addressing.

Dan Galloway stated that he had attended the "Connecting to Legacy Data" workshop at COVITS and there was a good deal of discussion on what information should be made available to citizens/businesses via the Web. There seemed to be a general consensus that folks would like to have a single place where they could go and find out the State's policies regarding security, access, etc. Dan suggested that the PSA Work group consider making the PSA Web site this place.

Dan Ziomek stated that DTP, working on behalf of the COTS Organization Work group, has developed a Commonwealth of Virginia Enterprise Architecture Web site: <http://www.cots.state.va.us/EA/>

Dan encouraged members to take a look at the definitions for component architectures that are listed on the new EA site. The enterprise architecture will include a "security" architecture that must address statewide privacy, security and access issues. In the future, the contents of the Commonwealth EA site, specifically the Security architecture component, and the new PSA Web site will probably need to converge.

Mike O'Neil briefed the work group on the PSA breakout session at the COVITS conference. Mike spoke on the Federal government briefing by Richard Guida, Chair, Federal PKI Steering Committee. He described the Federal government "bridge architecture".

Mike stated that Capitol One spoke on lessons learned and different strategies they use in their security program. One lesson learned in providing internet services is to be ready for an increased demand for all related customer support services. Need to implement a "help desk" to make a successful pilot.

Virgil Kopf, DGIF, reported that DOA and the APA have reviewed their agency's process for electronic forms

and signatures. They currently have implemented about 30 forms.

Dan Ziomek asked if the DOA had to put any infrastructure in place.

Virgil Kopf stated that DOA did not have to put any infrastructure in place to receive or validate the DGIF forms in electronic format. DOA agreed to when DGIF prints with name and date, they would accept the signature as an original document.

## **UPCOMING TOPICS**

- Executive Order 51 - refers to 3-4 privacy, security issues to be addressed by DPT, DIT and Secretary Upson.
- Review EO51 and reaffirm scope, goals and priorities of the work group.

**Next scheduled PSA Meeting: Tuesday, November 2, 1999**

1:00-3:00 p.m.

DMV Richmond HQ, Room 702

2300 W. Broad Street